Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/587,088	KOBAYASHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JOHN MABRY	1625
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>JOHN MABRY</u> .	(3)	
(2) Gary C. Cohn.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 6 April 2010	Time: <u>2:20 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicate Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Written description for the term "aryl" and obviousness double p	atenting over US 7,541,307.	
Claims discussed:		
1 and 3		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
In order to expediate the prosecution of the instant case, Examin case. Examiner explained the written description of the term "as Specification. Examiner also explained to Attny Cohn of an obv. properly filed terminal disclaimer would have to be filed. Attny Cimmediate action because he had to consult with his client prior consideration of issues and will send an Office Action which will	ryl" and that there was no specific of iousness double patenting issue of ohn considered issues discussed to reaching any agreement. Exan	definition of this term in the ver US 7,541,307 and that a but respectfully could not take niner appreciates Attny Cohn
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/John Mabry/ Examiner, Art Unit 1625 (A	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	tive Signature – if appropriate)